

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/469,865	12/22/1999	MARCO WINTER	RCA-89.912	5460
24498 IOSEPH I I A	7590 07/05/2007 KS VICE PRESIDENT		EXAM	INER
JOSEPH J. LAKS, VICE PRESIDENT THOMSON LICENSING LLC			FLETCHER, JAMES A	
PATENT OPE PO BOX 5312			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312	NJ 08543-5312		2621	
		•		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/469,865	WINTER, MARCO		
Office Action Summary	Examiner .	Art Unit		
•	James A. Fletcher	2621		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior is a failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature to reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tte, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26	January 2007			
<u> </u>	is action is non-final.			
· <u>-</u>	,—			
closed in accordance with the practice under				
•				
Disposition of Claims		·		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the applicatio				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to th				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
<u> </u>	n priprituunder 25 H.C.C. (\$ 440(a) (d) as (6)		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	in priority under 35 U.S.C. §	3 119(a)-(d) or (t).		
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received	·		
2. Certified copies of the priority document		application No.		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	•			
application from the International Bure		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	received.		
Attachment(s)	∧ □	Over-1 (DTO 440)		
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of I	nformal Patent Application		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:			

Art Unit: 2621

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al (6,075,920) in further view of Udagawa (5,706,261).

Regarding claim 1, Kawamura et al disclose a replay appliance for accessing at a defined playing time information stored on a recording medium containing information blocks (Fig. 2);

- a scanning device for scanning data on a recording medium (Col 14, lines 54-65);
- search means for searching of the recording medium on the basis of replay time (Col. 5, lines 58-67); and
- a comparator for comparing a replay time which has been scanned from the
 recording medium with a desired replay time, wherein the scanning device
 scans the recording medium at a point which corresponds to a result of a
 comparison by the comparison by the comparator to access information at the
 defined playing time (Col 14, line 66 Col 15, line 42).

Art Unit: 2621

Kawamura et al disclose a means for searching of the recording medium on the basis of replay time based on binary data searching and comparison as analyzed and discussed above, but do not specifically disclose that the search is a "binary search."

Udagawa teaches binary searches (Fig. 4 and Col 6, lines 9-16) provide the user with a quick and reliable search, and is a well known method of locating desired data in a file, as noted in the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences decision.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kawamura et al in order to include a binary search method for locating a defined playing time information.

Regarding claim 2, Kawamura et al disclose that the search means for a binary searching is a comparator for comparing the information read from the recording medium with a binary word, and an evaluator for evaluating a recording medium replay time contained in a file associated with the binary word (Col 14, line 66 - Col 15, line 42).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Kawamura et al disclose that the binary word is a designator recorded on the recording medium and is a navigation sector designator (Col 5, lines 49-67).

Regarding claim 6, Kawamura et al disclose that the desired replay time is a replay time which is intended for access, at a defined playing time, to the recording medium (Col 14, line 66 - Col 15, line 42).

Art Unit: 2621

Regarding claim 7, Kawamura et al disclose that the desired replay time is a replay time provided within a tolerance window, for access, at a defined playing time, to the recording medium (Col 14, line 66 - Col 15, line 15).

Regarding claim 8, Kawamura et al disclose that the comparator for comparing a replay time that has been found with a desired replay time drives the scanning device to a point on the recording medium which corresponds to the result of the comparison (Col 14, line 66 - Col 15, line 42).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Kawamura et al discloses that for access at a defined playing time, the comparator drives the scanning device to a point on the recording medium which corresponds to the defined playing time; and the scanning device is controlled using an iterative approximation method to a point on the recording method to a point on the record medium which corresponds to the defined playing time (Col 14, line 66 - Col. 15 line 42).

3. Claims 3 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Carter et al (5,845,331).

Regarding claim 3, Kawamura et al disclose comparing information read from the recording medium with a binary word (Col 5, lines 49-67 and Col 14, line 66 - Col 15, line 42). However, Kawamura et al does not disclose that the comparator is a mask. Carter et al teach a masked comparator (Fig. 14B).

Digital data is packetized into bytes, which consist of 8 bits. Mask comparators allow comparison of specific bits in a byte. It would have been highly desirable to have a

Art Unit: 2621

mask comparator so that the specific bits representing time information could be compared with the desired playback time indicated by the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a mask comparator in the device of Kawamura et al.

Regarding claim 11, Kawamura et al discloses that the binary word is a designator recorded on the recording medium (Col 5, lines 49-67).

Regarding claim 12, Kawamura et al discloses that the designator is a navigation sector designator (Col 5, lines 49-67).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Fletcher whose telephone number is (571) 272-7377. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:45-5:45 M-Th, first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Groody can be reached on (571) 272-7950. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JAF 31 January 2007

Harda Y Halker

JOHN MILLER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600